

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,737	05/04/2005	Johannis F. Blacquiere	NL 021137	4554
97182098 PHILLIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAMINER	
			ALUNKAL, THOMAS D	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Application No. Applicant(s) 10/533 737 BLACQUIERE ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit THOMAS D. ALUNKAL 2627 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2008. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1.4-7 and 9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,4-7 and 9 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 May 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some \* c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Art Unit: 2627

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/26/08 has been entered.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-7, and 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### DETAILED ACTION

## Claim Objections

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 7 recites the term "servomechanism". This term should be provided as two words (i.e., "servomechanism"). Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2627

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the focusing signal". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishinami et al. (hereafter Kishinami)(US 6,118,739) and in view of Okamoto (US 5,225,755).

Regarding claim 1, Kishinami discloses an apparatus for processing data on a data carrier which rotates about an axis and on which tracks are provided for containing said data, said track spiraling around a center, said apparatus comprising an angle measuring device from which said angle information is derived, the angle measuring device being constituted by an eccentricity measurer sensitive to the non-coincidence of said axis and center (Figures 1A, 10 and Column 2, lines 37-58); a PID operator for the tracking of a beam on the track, said PID operator comprising an I operator, wherein said eccentricity measurer takes account of the signal at the output of the I operator

Art Unit: 2627

(Figure 4A, Element 96, PID, and Column 10, lines 9-17). Kishinami does not specifically disclose where a peak/bottom is connected to the output of the I operator. In the same field of endeavor, Okamoto discloses an eccentricity measuring apparatus (Figure 4) which comprises an eccentricity detecting element (Figure 4, Element 22) that contains a peak/bottom detector (Figure 5, Elements 22a and 22b) used to accurately detect an eccentricity amount based on in input error value (Column 6, lines 41-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to provide the peak/bottom detector of Okamoto at the output of the I operator, outputting an error signal, of Kishinami, motivation being to accurately detect the eccentricity amount of the data carrier.

Regarding claim 4, Kishinami discloses a frequency multiplier for providing pulses, wherein said frequency multiplier is linked to the output of the I operator, and wherein angular position information is derived from said frequency multiplier (Column 16, lines13-18).

Regarding claim 5, Kishinami discloses wherein the PID operator acts on a radial tracking signal (Figure 4A, Element 140, PID acting on TES).

Regarding claim 6, Kishinami discloses wherein the PID operator acts on the focusing signal (Figure 4A, Element 96 acting on FES).

Method claim 7 is drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claim 1. Therefore method claim 7 corresponds to apparatus claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons of obviousness as used above.

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding claim 9, this claim recites limitations similar to those in method claim 7 and is rejected for the reasons provided above.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yamashita et al. (US 5,896,354) discloses an optical storage apparatus. Watanabe et al. (US 6,542,917) discloses a storage apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS D. ALUNKAL whose telephone number is (571)270-1127. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on (571)272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thomas D Alunkal/ Examiner, Art Unit 2627

/Wayne Young/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627